

## **REMARKS**

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 2 to be in independent form by including therein all of the limitations of claim 1, from which claim 2 previously depended. Claim 2 has further been amended to clarify that the fine structure is formed on a substrate by deforming a resin substrate or a resin film on a substrate, and to recite that the mold comprises a laminated structure, the laminated structure including a base member having a curved surface and a pattern member having a concave-convex pattern. See, by way of example only, Figures 5b and 6b and the description thereof in Applicants' specification. Claims 3-5 have been amended to be consistent with amended claim 2. Claims 6-8 and 11 have been amended to depend from claim 2, and claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants' affirm their provisional election to prosecute the invention of Group I, including claims 1-11. Non-elected claims 12-23 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, including the cancellation of the claim 1, the rewriting of claim 2 in independent form and the amendments amending the remaining claims to ultimately depend from claim 2, the rejections in numbered sections 7, 10, 11 and 13 are moot.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the Johnson publication. Applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

The claims now in the application recite that the mold has a laminated structure including a base member having a curved surface and a pattern member having a concave-convex pattern, the mold being provided with a curved surface and the side

thereof on which the concave-convex pattern is formed. Such a mold can be easily released from the substrate with high accuracy and without deforming the fine concave-convex pattern formed on the substrate.

The Johnson publication discloses selectively compliant orientation stages for imprint lithography. Pages 59 and 60 of this publication disclose a curved template used for printing on curved structures. It is disclosed that the template is attached to a piece of a flat square quartz. Thus, this document does not disclose a mold having a laminated structure including a base member having a curved surface and a pattern member having a concave-convex pattern, the mold being provided with a curved surface on the side thereof on which the concave-convex pattern is formed. Moreover, the curved template in Johnson is used to transfer patterns to curved substrates, not to improve the release of the mold from the substrate. Therefore, there would have been no apparent reason to modify the template of Johnson to arrive at that presently claimed. Therefore, the presently claimed nanoprint mold is neither disclosed by nor obvious over Johnson.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the article by Ruchhoeft et al. Applicants traverse this rejection and reconsideration thereof.

The article by Ruchhoeft et al., like that of Johnson (it appears Johnson may be one of the coauthors of Ruchhoeft et al.), discloses the production of curved step and flash imprint lithography templates. These templates can be used to replicate their relief structures reliably and quickly on curved substrates. Thus, like Johnson, the Ruchhoeft et al. article discloses a curved template for the purpose of transferring patterns to curved substrates, not to improve the release of the mold from the substrate. Moreover, the Ruchhoeft et al. article does not disclose the presently claimed mold including a

laminated structure including a base member having a curved surface and a pattern member having a concave-convex pattern, the mold being provided with a curved surface on the side thereof on which the concave-convex patterned is formed.

Accordingly, the Ruchhoeft et al. article does not disclose and would not have rendered obvious of the presently claimed.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruchhoeft et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,817,242 to Biebuyck et al. Applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

The Examiner has cited the patent to Biebuyck et al. as disclosing a mold having both shallow and deep grooves. However, clearly nothing in this patent remedies any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the Ruchhoeft et al. article. Accordingly, it is submitted the presently claimed invention is patentable over the proposed combination of Ruchhoeft et al. and Biebuyck et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now in the application are requested.

Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (1021.43672X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Alan E. Schiavelli  
Registration No. 32,087

AES/at  
1300 North Seventeenth Street  
Suite 1800  
Arlington, VA 22209  
Telephone: (703) 312-6600  
Fax: (703) 312-6666